

From: GH
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/23/02 7:53am
Subject: Spank Microsoft...

Sir or Madam,

Below you will find email correspondence with Connecticut Attorney General, Richard Blumenthal. He mentioned that I could also state my opinion to this body as well. That opinion follows directly after the "GH wrote:" section below.

Before you get there, however, I would like to make one addition to what I have stated below. I would like to see Microsoft forced into releasing a version of Windows without Internet Explorer welded to the operating system. I mean totally removed, not uninstallable, not leaving "stubs" of functionality hidden, totally removed. Of late, Internet Explorer's inclusion has caused no end of grief as we must constantly patch the browser if we want to remain secure on the Internet. Since there is little technical reason, if any, to bolt the OS and browser together, I feel Internet Explorer's removal would actually lead to more secure systems "out of the box". This holds true for all current desktop and server versions of the Windows product.

Simply put, the Internet Explorer browser, as provided and bolted to Windows, is an insecure addition to an already insecure operating system that satisfies Microsoft's strategic goals while causing more work for systems administrators and exposing millions of consumers world-wide to compromised security.

It is time that Microsoft shoulders the burden for all the ills they have visited upon a thriving Information Technology industry and its consumers.

Thanks for your time,

Geoffrey Harnett
IT Engineer.

--- Richard Blumenthal <attorney.general@po.state.ct.us> wrote:
> Date: Wed, 09 Jan 2002 11:44:51 -0500
> From: Richard Blumenthal <attorney.general@po.state.ct.us>
> To: GH <g_harnett@yahoo.com>
> Subject: Re: Spank Microsoft...
>
>
>
> GH wrote:
>
>> Sir or Madam,
>>

>> In no way do I agree with the proposed DOJ settlement with Microsoft.
> There
>> are simply no teeth and rest assured, any settlement that Bill Gates is
>> comfortable with is flawed. The only options that will prevent Microsoft
> from
>> further hindering competition and abusing its monopoly are those that will
>> hurt. I feel the measures presented by the hold-out states will be more
>> effective as a punishment and deterrent than what has been decided by the
> DOJ.
>>
>> However, I think there should be one more area in which Microsoft should be
>> scrutinized. Its code. Specifically, has Microsoft enhanced Windows and
>> application functionality by unlawfully using GPL'd (or other open source
>> licensed) code without adhering to the particular license mandates and in
>> effect, stealing it? There should be a mechanism that allows open source
>> license holders, via a trusted third party, to inspect Windows code in a
> safe
>> room for infringement on open source code. If caught violating any licensed
>> code they should be sued for damages, which essentially forces them to
> release
>> their "enhanced" code under the violated license.
>>
>> I feel that Microsoft's abject dislike of the GPL license can be directly
>> attributed to fear of being caught using code distributed under that
> license in
>> Windows yet not freely redistributing enhanced code as the license
> requires.
>>
>> Microsoft has proven themselves wholly untrustworthy in business and in the
>> courtroom. If they will lie in Federal court without any remorse then they
>> will certainly abuse open source licenses for their gain.
>>
>> Thanks for your time,
>>
>> Geoffrey Harnett
>> IT Engineer
>>
>>
>> _____
>> Do You Yahoo!?
>> Send your FREE holiday greetings online!
>> <http://greetings.yahoo.com>
>
> Dear Mr. Harnett:
>
> Thank you for your recent thoughtful correspondence concerning the Microsoft
> antitrust case.
>
> As you know, on November 6, 2001, the United States Department of Justice
> and Microsoft filed a proposed settlement. I did not join that settlement

> because I do not believe it would accomplish the goals we set when we filed
> the case. Nor would it accomplish the remedial goals set by the U.S. Court
> of Appeals: (1) to prohibit the illegal conduct and similar conduct in the
> future, (2) to spark competition in this industry; and (3) to deprive
> Microsoft of its illegal gains.

>

> You may also express your opinion to the judge of the federal trial court
> considering this settlement by filing written comments with the United
> States Department of Justice by January 28, 2002, as follows:

>

> Mail: Renata B. Hesse
> Antitrust Division
> U.S. Department of Justice
> 601 D Street NW
> Suite 1200
> Washington, DC 20530-0001

>

> [NOTE: Given recent mail delivery interruptions in Washington, D.C., and
> current uncertainties involving the resumption of timely mail service, the
> Department of Justice strongly encourages that comments be submitted via
> e-mail or fax.]

>

> E-mail: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
> In the Subject line of the e-mail, type "Microsoft Settlement."

>

> Fax : 1-202-307-1454 or 1-202-616-9937

>

> Please keep me informed of your opinions on the case.

>

> Thank you again for contacting me.

> --

> Sincerely,
> Richard Blumenthal
> Attorney General

>

>

Do You Yahoo!?

Send FREE video emails in Yahoo! Mail!

<http://promo.yahoo.com/videomail/>